

## **Historic, Archive Document**

**Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.**



Ag86Hs

Houston, I. F.

Address before American national  
live stock asso. 1919.



986 Ha

# ADDRESS OF D. F. HOUSTON

Secretary of Agriculture

BEFORE THE

AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION,  
DENVER, COLO., JANUARY 22, 1919



Agot Ha

Feb 24 '19

WASHINGTON  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
1919



350672

ADDRESS OF D. F. HOUSTON,  
SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,

BEFORE THE AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION, DENVER, COLO.,  
JANUARY 22, 1919.

---

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

It is just two years, as the calendar runs, since I had the privilege of addressing the members of this association. I had the pleasure of attending your meeting in Cheyenne the latter part of January, 1917. But, when we consider what has happened since that time, it seems as if a quarter of a century must have elapsed. More history has been made in the two years than in two generations.

I remember very distinctly with what feelings I left Washington to go to Cheyenne. I remember that Germany had made promise after promise and had outrageously violated each promise and disregarded her solemn word. As I left Washington, the question was whether another solemn promise of Germany would be broken. Then I not only desired to meet the members of this association to understand more fully what was in their minds and what we could do for them, but also to mingle once more with the people of the West to get a little reassurance. As my good friend, Senator Kendrick, will tell you, the waves of trouble, many of them real, many of them imaginary, beat in on Washington till the most hardened man gets a little sensitive, and, if he does not look out, a little cowardly. In such circumstances, it is good for him to get away from Washington and to mingle with the people. At the time of my trip many people in the East were asking "What about the West? Are the people there not asleep?" A meeting had been held in Washington at which a proposal was made to send missionaries to the West to teach the people patriotism and to wake them up. I was asked what I thought about it. I replied that I would not guarantee the safety of such visitors and that they would discover that the western people, as usual, were as wide awake as those of any other part of the Nation. When I returned to Washington I heard the same sort of talk. Then the note had come from Germany flatly repudiating everything that she had solemnly promised. Most of us knew what that

meant, and people again asked, "Why, what about the West?" "Well," I said, "if you have any doubt about the West"—and they had, or they would not have asked the question—"go out and mingle with its people." I had a gentleman at my house one evening from the East and also Senator Kendrick. My eastern friend had been inquiring about the West, and I said, "Senator, what about the West? What about Wyoming?" I am going to quote the Senator whether he wants me to or not. He said, "Before I left Wyoming every man I saw and every man who wrote to me or telephoned me said: 'We are already in this war. We might as well recognize it, and everything that we are and everything that we have is back of the Nation.'" I thought I would let one of these westerners answer the gentleman rather than to undertake to answer him myself, and I think he was satisfied.

How many of you realized what it would mean when we took up that challenge of Germany, who wanted to know what we would do about it when she told us to stay at home and stay off the seas and keep our goods at home until she got ready to act differently? How many of you realized that in 18 months we would have three and a half million men in the Army and over two million of them in France, 3,000 miles across the water? Why, I remember talking, two evenings before we entered the war, with one of the ablest foreign ambassadors, and he said: "Of course, you are neutral, but if you should enter the war, my Government would not expect you to send more than a detachment to Europe to return the visit of Rochambeau." A great many people thought that our part would be limited to economic and moral contributions; but you know how conditions changed. You know how Russia, that great untrained people, who had been denied the things that the people of this Nation had had from the beginning, went to pieces; how Germany, mobilizing all her forces, gave us the most distressing period of the whole war from March until July, and how the American boys, cooperating with the Allies, struck the head of their advance at Chateau Thierry, when the retreat began which has not stopped yet.

#### THE WAR AND ITS RESULTS.

Now, while we are still in a state of war, the fighting on any considerable scale is ended. And with what results? No man in this audience or in this Nation can yet appreciate what has happened. Governments and institutions, apparently the most firmly fixed in the world, have crumbled. The Romanoffs have disappeared, and the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgs, and all the other little medieval hangers-on in Central Europe; redress of the outrage done to France in 1870 has been secured, and the firm beginnings of new nations on the basis of national interests and aspirations have

been made. The Holy Land, after centuries, has been delivered; the Turks probably are about to be put out of Europe; a wave of democracy, which, for the time being, naturally threatens to run a little too far, but which will partially recede and result in firm democratic arrangements in Central and Eastern Europe, has swept over that continent; and a new Poland, a new Czech and a new Jugoslav nation make their bows to the world. And with what spirit the whole people of this Nation confronted the grave problems before them and endured sacrifices; and not only the boys who went to Europe to vindicate our rights for world freedom and liberty, not only the boys, but also the men at home and the brothers and the sisters, and even more, the mothers!

#### THE SPIRIT OF THE PEOPLE.

It has been my good fortune during the war to go about from time to time among the people; and it was as much as I could do to face an American audience and speak to it, because of the spirit I witnessed everywhere and of the obvious fact that the people were eager to do more than their part, to do more than anybody could wisely direct. This I was conscious of no matter where I went. I remember being in Montana recently, in the midst of one of the most distressed districts I have seen. I was waiting for a train at a hotel in a little town when a man came in. He did not look very successful and I supposed he had come to discuss a loan or perhaps to make some complaint; but I was mistaken. When I talked with him about the war I soon discovered I could not tell him anything about it, either as to its origin, its progress, or its meaning; and when he left me he said: "I have three boys in France. I suppose it would be too much to expect that I shall get them all back. I should like to, of course. I hope at any rate to get two, or one of them; but no matter what happens, they will have made their contribution to the cause of liberty and civilization." I found that spirit prevailing everywhere. Is it not clear that a Nation permeated with that spirit from top to bottom, and with no other motive than to bring freedom to the world, was invincible?

Of course, you have had your troubles. You had your troubles during the war. You still have them. We all have them. They are part of the price we have to pay for safeguarding our freedom. It has been difficult for us to turn our minds from the task of winning the war to the tasks of peace.

I experience the same difficulty in directing my mind from war that a very brilliant Polish gentleman and friend of mine does in directing his thoughts from his new nation. You know we have recently had a good many new foreign governments in Washington.

We have had the president of the Czecho-Slovaks and the president of the Polish Nation with his aid, a gentleman who has been living in this country for several years. This aid has been so interested in Poland and so excited about Poland that, no matter what he was discussing, every few seconds his mind would come back to Poland and he would talk about Poland.

One day he became aware of this failing and said he was reminded of a story. A French natural history society desired to know more about the elephant and offered a large prize for the best paper. It received many. It received one from a Frenchman, who took as his subject, "The Elephant and His Loves"; one from an Englishman who took as his subject, "The Hunting of Elephants and Other Big Game in the Wilds of Africa"; one from an American, with the subject, "The Elephant and His Utilization in Transportation"; one from a German, with the title, "A Brief Introduction to the Study of the Development of the Nasal Bone of the Elephant"; and one from a Pole, who selected the subject, "The Elephant and the Polish Question."

We are all like the Pole: We can not easily turn our minds away from what they have been so intensely dwelling upon; we can not get away from the war; and, of course, we shall not get away from it for a long time.

#### THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION.

But we are turning to our new problems and they are numerous and difficult. People are asking what the agricultural situation is and what ought to be done. They ask what suggestions we have to make to the producers of the country. Now, we made many suggestions to the producers of the country during the war. We urged them to increase production. We had definite programs. You know how the farmers, including the cattlemen, responded to the appeals of the Government and reacted under the economic stimulus. In spite of all the troubles, in spite of labor difficulties and adverse weather conditions, the farmers of this Nation planted in leading cereals alone 38,000,000 more acres in 1918 than they had planted on the average in peace times. The live stock producers increased every class of live stock during the war. The report of the Bureau of Crop Estimates on live stock is just out. It shows that, since the European war began four years and a half ago, the number of horses increased 570,000, the number of mules 470,000, milch cows 2.7 millions, other cattle 8.5 millions, swine 16,700,000, 5 millions within the last year, and sheep, in the last two years, by about 2.1 millions, somewhat over a million each year since we entered the war.

Our farmers increased the wheat acreage for the 1918 crop over the prewar five-year average by 12 millions and produced about 918

million bushels. They planted last fall 7 million more acres than the record of the preceding year, or 49 million acres. And now we are confronted with a very interesting problem. We do not know what the spring planting will be or how the wheat will come through the winter; but it entered the winter in much better condition than usual and is making good headway. The indications are that the spring planting will be large. We may have from 1,000,000,000 to 1,100,000,000 bushels. We need for domestic purposes about 650,000,000 bushels.

The question is whether we can sell the crop at the guaranteed price. Remember that this crop will not come in until next summer and fall and that conditions will change in the world by that time. Every nation in Europe will leave nothing undone to secure a larger production of things from which it can get a quick response. Shipping is opening up. Australia, where the price of wheat is \$1.18, will come into the market with her reserves and her new production. Argentina and Algeria, the latter with a surplus now of 25 millions, will have fair crops.

It seems highly improbable that the market conditions a year from now will be such as to cause the European nations to take our surplus at the price fixed by the Government. They will not do so if they can get wheat cheaper elsewhere. The producer must get the guaranteed price for the wheat he markets, and if the price falls 1 cent or 50 cents or \$1 below the guaranteed price the Government will sustain a loss. The only way to effectuate the guarantee and to carry out the pledge of the Government made during the war—and remember that Congress had voted a higher guarantee, which the President did not sanction—is for the Government to handle the wheat and sell it at the market price. We may not lose anything; we may have to put up hundreds of millions.

This will serve as an illustration of the difficulty confronting us. It is only one of many. There is no little confusion of the public mind arising from a failure to distinguish clearly between present supplies and needs and those of the future, and to recognize that production plans must be made for the current season and year in view of changed and changing conditions. Somebody says: "Europe is starving. We must send loads of things over there. Therefore, tell the farmers to get busy and to produce, produce, produce, regardless of consequences." Those who are doing most of the talking are thinking only of present European needs and available supplies. But the condition a year from now may be quite different. A production season intervenes. Europe will plant everything she can. Her present pressing needs will have been met. Clearly anyone will assume a grave responsibility who, listening to these appeals, undertakes to incite the American farmer to unlimited production, who

does not harvest until next summer and fall and who must take the hazards of the weather and the risks of the market.

The president of your association said yesterday that the department and the Food Administration were urging very great increases in production. They did so before the fighting ended. Their literature which your president had in mind was put out while the war was still on. Conditions have altered, and we must recast our plans with changed conditions. I am very much in doubt whether one can safely give the American farmer to-day other advice than that he should follow the best agricultural practice and make his plans to suit his particular conditions and the conditions in his region. During the war we have done things that were not based on good agricultural practice and not calculated, in the long run, to produce the best results. While I think that the world market for available supplies will be such as to keep their prices at a remunerative level, I am not prophet enough to say what the conditions will be after the next harvest and at a more distant date when the products of your present live-stock planning and operations will appear on the market.

#### INCREASING POPULATION AND LIVE-STOCK NEEDS.

There are certain things, however, that we may keep in mind. We know, of course, that Europe will have difficulty in making full recovery in respect to her live stock. In England, live stock has been prudently conserved. Her herds have been preserved, especially her breeding animals, and England will recover quickly. France has been harder hit. There are no accurate estimates as to how much her stock has been reduced. Switzerland has kept her herds. They have not produced as much during the war as before; but they are relatively intact. Germany and Austria have suffered greatly. There will probably be a continuing substantial demand for meat products. To what extent there will be demand for breeding animals is another question because European countries will be very conservative in introducing breeding stock from this country, or from places to which they have not heretofore looked.

We may bear this in mind also: This is a growing Nation, growing so fast that very few people keep up with it. How many of you realize that in 15 years, from 1900 to 1915, we gained a population of 24 million, a population greater than that of any South American country except one, and greater than that of any South American country in point of producing and consuming capacity, a population three-fifths that of France. We have gained 3.5 millions of people during the European war. I assume that we shall gain at the rate of a million or more for the next 20 or 25 years. Now, while the increases I gave a moment ago are large and gratifying, they were due to the existence of recent peculiar conditions; and we must recognize that live-stock production in this country has not kept up

with increasing population. The number of cattle in 1918 is given at 44 million, but we had about 42 million at the 1910 census. The increases are recent. We have got to plan for a population in the next 20 years of 20 million or 25 million more, and we must make our plans now. We can not largely develop the live-stock industry overnight or wisely alter their permanent foundations quickly.

#### FARMING MUST PAY.

In making these plans, we must base them on sound economic considerations, looking to their foundations of feed, of pasture, and of grazing. We have to keep one fact in mind which city people especially seem to ignore. There is more nonsense talked about farming and about getting people to go into farming and to stay in farming than about any other one thing. People are constantly crying, "Back to the land!" They seem to think there can be an indefinite number of farmers. Now people are going into farming and are going to stay on farms if farming pays and if country life is attractive, and not otherwise; and just enough people will stay on farms to produce the supply the Nation and the world seek at a price which will justify it. I am pestered no little by city people who ask, "Why do you not continue to urge the farmers to produce and to produce and to produce?" Of course, that would be very nice for them, especially if they could get the products for nothing; but that is not the way agriculture proceeds. It must show a reasonable profit. This does not mean necessarily that prices need stay at the present level and continue to rise. It may be possible to reduce costs. They will fall with the return of normal conditions. We may lessen them by controlling or eradicating animal and plant diseases. You, the department, the agricultural colleges, and other agencies are engaged in this task.

#### REGULATED GRAZING.

We can help also by improving grazing conditions. We have greatly bettered them in the National Forests. I have been advocating for six years something that seemed to me obvious from the beginning, that there should be improvement of grazing on public lands. The Department of Agriculture has been urging this for 15 years. The Department of Agriculture has been urging classification of public lands, not that there should be a rigid classification which could not be changed, but one which might be reconsidered at frequent intervals.

Clearly grazing should be regulated on the public lands so that they may support many more animals. I was glad to hear a representative of the Department of the Interior say yesterday that he is now in favor of this policy. I have been surprised that he has not been in favor of it from the outset. We tried to get the Kent bill through. It might have gone through if there had been a favorable

report on it from both departments. Now comes the suggestion at this late day from the Interior Department that there should be regulated grazing on the public domain, that it should and must be handled by that department, that there should not be two agencies controlling grazing, and that, therefore, the National Forests should be turned back to the Interior Department. And why? Because that department holds the title to the land and the Government would not think of transferring title to another department.

A trifle amusing, is it not, both the reason and the proposal? The title to land in the National Forests is in the Interior Department, and the grazing in them is regulated by the Department of Agriculture. Obviously, if the Government wished, that department could regulate grazing on the public domain outside the forests with title still lodged in the Department of the Interior. Or even the latter department might keep title and apply to the public lands grazing regulations similar to those enforced by the Department of Agriculture in the forests. The reason assigned is not pertinent and can not be controlling.

All the reasons are against the proposal. The control of grazing should not follow the location of land title. It should follow the location of expert agricultural knowledge and successful experience. Grazing is an agricultural problem and should be handled by agricultural experts. Land lawyers can handle and should continue to handle land titles, but I do not believe that they can or should handle live-stock problems. Would it not be a little singular to transfer regulated grazing from the department which has favored it from the beginning, made a success of it, and demonstrated its value, to one which has had no experience with it and no facilities for controlling it?

Grazing is not the only agricultural activity in the National Forests. There are others. There are problems of reforestation and of insect, game, and predatory animal control. The services of a number of bureaus of the Department of Agriculture are constantly and increasingly required, such as Forestry, Animal Industry, Entomology, Biology, and Markets. Forestry problems are mainly agricultural problems. Why, this meeting has seemed to me to be a sort of conference of the Department of Agriculture. A considerable part of the speech of your president dealt with the Department of Agriculture. Most of your speakers yesterday and to-day have been drawn from its staff.

I have no personal interest in this matter. It would save me a great deal of trouble if I had nothing to do with it; and, after a few years at most, I shall not have anything to do with it; but I am interested in the merits of this question and in seeing it properly handled. I repeat that grazing, the handling of live stock, the con-

trol of predatory animals, of poisonous weeds, of reforestation, of marketing are all agricultural problems and the Department of the Interior could not properly deal with them unless it took over the Department of Agriculture or built up a duplicate of it.

#### SOME CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS.

I wish very much that I might speak to you about some other things. We have very definite constructive proposals in mind—to promote profitable agriculture and to develop a more attractive country life. In fact, nearly everything being done by your association and similar associations, by the Department of Agriculture, with its 23,000 people, and the State colleges, constitutes an attack, a persistent and quiet attack, on the problem of profitable agriculture and better rural life. Their work is not spectacular. You do not hear much about it, especially in the city; but men and women of the department and the colleges are working hourly in season and out of season without advertisement, and are getting results. I sometimes think it is almost a mistake to do things as well as some of our people do them, because they do not have time to get on the housetop and shout about it, and many people do not seem to think anything is being done if they do not hear a lot of shouting.

I think we ought to speed up our road building. I need not argue the value of good roads. I have suggested, with the President's approval, that we increase the Federal funds to be used to supplement the Federal aid road appropriation, not only because roads are indispensable, but also because public work of this sort may profitably be extended for the purpose of furnishing employment to surplus labor during the transition period. I am suggesting that a part of the additional funds be used for further construction of roads in the National Forests.

I wish I had time to speak of marketing and of the Bureau of Markets. Mr. Brand has had a difficult task in organizing his great service, the greatest of its kind in the world to-day. He has developed it from nothing, having to get men for work of great difficulty for which few men had been trained. The bureau is now spending something like \$4,000,000 to aid the producers of this country to distribute their products to better advantage. I need not tell you that distribution is at least the second half of agriculture; and yet some gentlemen are complaining because we wish enough money to enable us to maintain our present undertakings. One part of the service alone is worth what the Government is spending on the bureau. I refer to the market news service. I can not take time to explain what it is doing. You know of some of its work and value it. I fear that service will be cut down. In my judgment it ought

to be expanded. Four millions of dollars is not too much to spend to try to aid the farmers of this Nation in marketing their products.

#### REGULATION OF STOCKYARDS AND PACKING HOUSES.

There are parts of our marketing arrangement in which you are and have been deeply interested. I refer to the stockyards and the packing houses. Two years ago I expressed my views before this body on the necessity of controlling these agencies. I have been convinced for many years that the Government should regulate them. I have really got beyond the point of seeing the necessity for further argument. Not only you, but all the people of the Nation, are intensely interested in what happens in the stockyards and the great packing houses. Their operations affect every man, woman, and child in this Nation.

These establishments, as the lawyer would say, are largely affected with the public interest. I do not know what percentage would express the public interest, but it would not fall very far short of 100 per cent. The people of this Nation are not willing to let a few men have an absolute determination of what happens in them, of what happens to the live\*stock of the Nation from the time plans are made for its production on the farm until it reaches the consumer. There is too much at stake. The fortunes of too many people are involved. Of course, those in control of the packing houses and the stockyards say that everything is just right. As Senator Kendrick says, they admit it. They have admitted it to me. They even spend great sums of money in the newspapers making admission of it. One of the chief representatives of the packers told me several years ago that the whole business was as clean as a hound's tooth and that there was nothing to be apprehensive about. I replied that, unfortunately, the people did not seem to believe this. They had their suspicions. I added: "If what you say is true, the people ought to hear the truth from an impartial source. It would be good business for you to have the people told the facts by an impartial authority, and good business for you to be rid of the suspicion that attaches to your statements and operations." Again, they admit that they have the requisite wisdom to handle these great establishments. They admit that they can handle them better than anybody else. They are wiser than all the people. That is what the paternalists, the favored few, have said from the beginning of history. That is the essence of the old medieval theory of government. A few men are wiser than all the people. Of course, I do not admit that. I do not admit that the few men in control of the packing houses and stockyards are wiser than all the stockmen of the Nation and all the consumers. I do not believe that they should be permitted, uncontrolled, to determine all the issues in which the

public is so vitally interested. If I had to admit that they possessed all the wisdom they say they do, then I would go further and say that I would prefer to have a little less wisdom, a little less paternalism, and a little more freedom, and, if necessary, to pay the difference.

I do not profess to have enough wisdom in a final way to indicate the items of the necessary legislation. Several proposals are pending in Congress. My opinion is that the Kendrick bill embodies the correct principle of action and furnishes the best basis for discussion and criticism yet presented. I believe that, with such amendments as may be proposed as the result of full consideration, that measure would probably accomplish the purpose you and all of us have in mind. It may not prove to be perfect. Very few measures do. If it does not, it can be amended; and if regulation and control should fail, then the time will have arrived to take the next step.

#### FUTURE TRADE AND EUROPEAN HANDICAP.

You are naturally interested in the probable course of trade now that the fighting has ceased. Many people are showing interest in it. Many of them are writing to me asking what I think of the future. Some of them seem to be apprehensive. They seem to be alarmed lest Europe should flood the markets of this Nation with cheap goods, alarmed lest this Nation may not be able to hold her own proper place in the markets of the world.

Apparently, there are those still left who believe that one nation can not profit except at the expense of another; who believe that a nation does not profit unless it exports useful commodities and imports nothing except gold. They do not seem to realize that this process can not be continued for a long time. They are unaware that too much gold even may be hurtful.

The things that any nation really wants are services and commodities. These a nation can not get except by furnishing services and commodities. This country has been for many years an exporter of agricultural products. Before the European war you will find upon examination that the excess of our agricultural exports ranged from three hundred millions to four or five hundred millions of dollars.

But people ask if this will continue. They ask if Europe will not now have a relative advantage. They seem to assume that Europe has had time to pile up masses of commodities for export and that Europe will possess from this time forward great masses of cheap labor. How inadequately they seem to have pictured the present actual conditions in Europe. Think of it. They tell us that in Europe, outside the Balkans and Turkey, more than 7 millions

of men have been killed and 14 millions wounded, many of them permanently incapacitated. We know there are great numbers of widows and orphans. We are aware of the destruction of property, of shipping, of the economic, social, and political disruption. Clearly it will take the powers of Central and Eastern Europe many years to lay the firm foundations of modern democratic governments, to set them in full operation, and to restore normal economic conditions and processes. The masses of the people in these sections will for the first time have something to say about economic and governmental matters. They will have something to say about their conditions and standards of living, and it is unthinkable that they will permit a return to former conditions.

Obviously, they will be greatly burdened also with war debts. It is probable that the war debt of England will equal 30 per cent of her estimated real wealth; that of France 50 per cent; of Germany 45 per cent; of Austria 65 per cent; and of Italy 30 per cent. In each case the annual interest charge will be as great as the former national budget or greater; and in every case provision must be made for a sinking fund. Yet some of our people seem to fear that this Nation, industrially almost untouched by the war, can not hold its own with stricken Europe. Should our thought not be rather how we can aid the people of Europe to get on their feet once more and to contribute in full measure to the world's dividend of useful commodities?

#### THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

The hour is too late for me to say much more. I can not close, however, without speaking of a subject which is uppermost in my mind. We have won a great fight. We have safeguarded this country from a terrible menace. For the last time, in my judgment, has the freedom of the world been seriously menaced by the will and power of despots. No arrogant governing body in the world is likely again to challenge the free nations of the world. Germany made a serious mistake in challenging the free nations of Europe; she added to it greatly in challenging this Nation. Germany made many mistakes, but none so fatal as that of thinking that anything her submarines could do to the Allies would be appreciable in comparison with what this Nation would do to her if she entered the war. I say that this menace is past. Germany will be incapable at least for many years of threatening any of the great nations. She will have all she can do for some time to cope with her domestic problems. This fortunate outcome justifies in no small measure the sacrifices of our boys and of our people at home; but the justification and satisfaction will be incomplete unless we secure at this time some kind of concert of action on the part of the civilized nations which will prevent a recurrence of this tragedy.

I am not prepared to offer a concrete scheme of a League of Nations. We doubtless shall not be able to evolve at this time a full-fledged and final plan. We can make a beginning. We must have a system of international law that will have a sanction, a sufficient body of law which will reflect the common purposes of civilized nations. Of course, nations have very much in common. They have been drawn closer and closer together within our own generation. Every day witnesses a closer union. The nations of the world to-day are nearer together than our States were a few generations ago.

Some seem to fear an impairment of our independence if a League of Nations is formed. Of course, in a very real sense we are not completely independent. No nation in the world to-day is completely independent. Recently we have more fully discovered that every nation is dependent upon every other nation. We have found that part of the world can not go to war without involving every other part. I do not believe that the development of real international law with a sanction and the formulation of a proper League of Nations will restrict our freedom or independence. On the contrary, it will increase it. Good laws, whether municipal, national, or international, do not limit freedom. They extend it. They restrict the activities only of the criminals and the desperadoes. I believe that provision can be made whereby the entrance of nations into war can be retarded, and, in many cases, prevented. I believe that many international troubles can be settled by orderly processes just as individual and national troubles are settled. I am not apprehensive that the Monroe Doctrine shall be invalidated. I believe, rather, that what is proposed will be in the nature of an extension of that doctrine over the world. I for one shall feel greatly depressed if there is not enough wisdom and unselfishness in the world to permit the conference now being held in Paris, to which our President went with his eyes open, knowing the difficulties as well as the supreme importance of action, to arrive at an agreement which will have the result of placing the combined force of civilized nations as a barrier to a recurrence of such a crisis as that through which we have passed.

May we not all look at this matter in a broad spirit of humanity and not from the lower plane of partisanship? We have stood together during this war as a people have never before stood together. It has enabled us to win the war and to win a cause. Do not the tasks of peace warrant an equal spirit of patriotic devotion and unity of purpose? Of course, I realize that there will be differences of opinion. I believe in parties, but I do not believe that, to have parties, it is necessary to have appeals to prejudice and a riot of misrepresentation. If all the facts bearing on questions at issue were available, if, so to speak, all the cards were on the table with their faces up, the

would still be room for differences of opinion and for the formation and conduct of parties.

Let the public demand that their representatives be big enough and broad enough to deal with the facts and nothing but the facts, to interpret them to the best of their ability and conscience and to follow their conclusions regardless of consequences. Democratic government will be sufficiently difficult if we apply this standard. If we permit any other to prevail, its future will be full of doubt. Let us remember the blessings of our institutions and keep before us their real spirit and meaning. Let us see to it that those who come among us from other countries not so favored, whose inheritance makes it difficult for them to understand the meanings and purposes of democratic institutions, shall catch their significance and especially be made to understand that here we have a rule of law and not of whim or of force.

There are some of our people who need an induction into the spirit and meaning of democracy. They must be taught that here any good cause can get a hearing, that those who advocate it must convert the majority, and that the majority will not permit any reckless, misguided minority to attempt to secure its purpose by violence.



most  
but  
of a  
on  
size  
by

at  
1941

Can. nations 17 five-									
Br. 1941.									

8-2432



